TRANSCRIFT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE Transcriber's Office FLOOR DEBATE

January 24, 2002 LB 82

have committee amendments pending, Mr. President. (AM1962, Legislative Journal page 1937, First Session, 2001.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Brashear, you're recognized to open on LB 82.

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the SENATOR BRASHEAR: In an effort to be as explanatory as possible, to everyone, with regard to this bill and the committee amendment, I'm going to depart from the usual procedure. I'm going to talk about how this bill came to be, and then talk about LB 82 and...and then allocate my time right into the committee amendment introduction. I have noticed that the bill has begun to pick up some drag, as I call it, and I think that can be This truly is a...the omnibus overcome with an explanation. criminal justice bill for the new millennium by your Judiciary It is true that together with the original bill it is what once was nine bills. But this is the result of hard work by the committee. The committee, it's...it's simply my name that's up there on LB 82, this is work product of the committee. There were hours spent in hearing each of the bills, taking testimony and considering it, in individual consultations among each and every member of the Judiciary Committee, some of which occurred as they do on this floor. And this was simply at that moment in time, the manner in which we thought we could bring before you wholly consistent matters relating to criminal justice upon which we thought you would then want to focus, frankly, we continue to believe you will want to focus in this year, albeit it an election year. And as you listen to the content of the bill I recognize that everybody may not agree with every single concept, but I believe you will be pleased, overall, with what we're presenting. Certainly that's for you to decide. But it was for us to put it in the best possible shape, and make it available to you. We would have been able to bring this bill, Senator Robak will speak for herself of course, but we would have been able to bring this bill unanimously before you, but to tell you how the dynamic works, and why it's 7-1, brought to you by your Judiciary Committee, instead of 8-0, it's because...it wasn't because Senator Robak had an objection to the bill, it was because she too had a bill which she wanted to include, but she was not able to overcome the intransigence